

### III. REMARKS

Claims 13-16 are pending in this application. Claim 13 has been amended, and claims 1-12 and 17-20 have been canceled. Claim 13 now reflects, *inter alia*, elements incorporated from cancelled claim 18. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

In the Office Action, claims 13-15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmi (US 6,436,353 B1) hereinafter, “Ohmi” in view of Ishihara et al. (US 6,605,134 B2) hereinafter, “Ishihara.” Further, claim 16 is rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmi in view of Ishihara, and further in view of Ha et al. (US 5,779,863) hereinafter, “Ha.”

The Office asserts that Ohmi discloses a “chemical reactive separator” which, *inter alia*, receives plasma-enhanced exhaust from the process chamber. (Office Action at p. 3-4). The Office uses for support, Figure 1 of Ohmi, which discloses a “Staged Cooler.” As is implicit in the Office’s comments with respect to the Staged Cooler, that

component is not equivalent to a “chemical reactive separator.” (Office Action at p. 2). The Office asserts that the Staged Cooler of Ohmi functions as an equivalent of the “first separator” of the claimed invention. (Id.). The Office also asserts that same Staged Cooler functions as an equivalent of the “chemical reactive separator” of the claimed invention. (Id. at p. 3-4). Where, “a first separator receiving exhaust from the chemical reactive separator” (claim 13), is claimed, Applicants assert that the first separator and the chemical reactive separator are distinct elements within the same system. As such, Ohmi does not disclose, *inter alia*, both claimed elements and their connection. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

The dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons stated above, as well as for their own additional features.

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants’ undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Spencer K. Warnick /

Spencer K. Warnick  
Reg. No. 40,398

Date: 12 June 2007

(MP)

Hoffman, Warnick & D’Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street, 14th Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044  
(518) 449-0047 (fax)